

KRISTIN K. MAYES  
Attorney General of Arizona  
(Firm AZ State Bar No. 14000)  
John Raymond Dillon IV (AZ State Bar No. 036796)  
Sarah Pelton (AZ State Bar No. 039633)  
Office of the Arizona Attorney General  
2005 North Central Avenue  
Phoenix, AZ 85004  
Phone: (602) 542-3725  
Fax: (602) 542-4377  
[consumer@azag.gov](mailto:consumer@azag.gov)  
Counsel for Plaintiff State of Arizona

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

State of Arizona, *ex rel.* Kristin K. Mayes,  
Attorney General, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Michael D. Lansky, L.L.C., dba Avid  
Telecom, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 4:23-cv-00233- TUC-CKJ  
(MAA)

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO  
DETERMINE THE SUFFICIENCY  
OF DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES  
AND OBJECTIONS TO  
PLAINTIFFS' FIRST REQUESTS  
FOR ADMISSION**

Pursuant to Rule 36(a)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff States (collectively, "Plaintiffs"), respectfully request the Court to determine the sufficiency of certain answers and objections from Defendants Michael D. Lansky, L.L.C. dba Avid Telecom ("Avid Telecom"), Stacey S. Reeves ("Reeves"), and Michael D. Lansky ("Lansky"), collectively, "Defendants", in response to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admission (the "Requests").

This Motion is supported by the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declaration of Sarah Pelton and the exhibits attached thereto, any oral argument that

1 may be heard on this issue, all other pleadings and papers on file in this action, and any  
 2 other evidence that may be presented to the Court.

### 3 4 **GOOD FAITH CONSULTATION CERTIFICATE**

5 In accordance with Rule 37(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local  
 6 Rule 7.2(j), undersigned counsel represents that prior to filing the instant Motion, Plaintiffs  
 7 attempted to personally confer with Defendants’ counsel regarding their failure to respond  
 8 to Plaintiffs’ Requests, but to no avail. *See* Declaration of Sarah Pelton (“Pelton Decl.”),  
 9 dated December 5, 2025 at ¶¶ 8-9, Ex. G. Accordingly, Plaintiffs were left with no  
 10 alternative other than to file and serve this Motion.

### 11 12 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

#### 13 **I. INTRODUCTION**

14 Plaintiffs brought this lawsuit to protect consumers from Defendants’ illegal  
 15 telemarketing and robocall schemes. As set forth in the Complaint, Defendants Avid  
 16 Telecom, Lansky and Reeves are in the business of providing Voice over Internet Protocol  
 17 (“VoIP”) services, facilitating or initiating robocalls, and/or helping others make illegal  
 18 robocalls – in violation of multiple state and federal laws.

19 On August 20, 2025, Plaintiffs served Defendants with the Requests seeking  
 20 admission of relevant and admissible evidence in Defendants’ knowledge related to  
 21 Plaintiffs’ causes of action under the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse  
 22 Prevention Act, the Telemarketing Sales Rules, the Telephone Consumer Protection Act,  
 23 the Truth in Caller ID Act, as well as other state and federal laws, and Defendant Avid  
 24 Telecom’s claimed defenses thereto. *See* Pelton Decl. at ¶ 3, Ex. A.

25 In violation of Rule 36, Defendants failed to provide timely and sufficient responses  
 26 to Plaintiffs’ Requests. *See* Pelton Decl. at ¶ 6. Accordingly, Plaintiffs request the Court to  
 27 determine the sufficiency of Defendants’ untimely responses.  
 28

## 1 **II. RELEVANT FACTS**

2 On or around August 20, 2025, Plaintiffs served each Defendant with the Requests  
 3 pursuant to Rule 36 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* Pelton Decl. at ¶ 3, Ex. A.  
 4 The Requests sought relevant discovery regarding matters at the heart of the Complaint  
 5 and Defendants’ defenses thereto, namely admissions concerning Defendants’ business of  
 6 facilitating, initiating, and/or helping others make illegal robocalls; Defendants’ business  
 7 records evidencing illegal telemarketing and robocalling activity; Defendants’ purposeful  
 8 failure to implement any mitigating or corrective measures to prevent the perpetration of  
 9 illegal telemarketing and robocalling activity; and the monies and compensation  
 10 Defendants earned through its illegal telemarketing and robocalling activity. *Id.* at Ex. A.

11 Pursuant to Rule 36(a)(3), Defendants were required to provide responses to  
 12 Plaintiffs’ Requests by September 19, 2025. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 36(a)(3) (“A matter is  
 13 admitted unless, within 30 days of being served, the party to whom the request is directed  
 14 serves on the requesting party a written answer or objection”).

15 On or around September 19, 2025, defense counsel emailed Plaintiffs’ counsel  
 16 seeking an extension until September 23, 2025 to serve Defendants’ responses. *See* Pelton  
 17 Decl. at ¶ 5, Ex. B. Plaintiffs’ counsel stipulated to the requested extended deadline;  
 18 however, Defendants did not serve their responses until September 24, 2025. *Id.* at ¶ 6-7,  
 19 Exs. C-F. Defendants’ untimely responses were insufficient as they were replete with  
 20 numbering and typographical errors, relied on meritless and boilerplate objections, and  
 21 failed to address the substance of the Requests. Additionally, Defendant Reeves served a  
 22 replacement set of RFAs the same day, as defense counsel recalled the first copy for  
 23 retaining attorney work product. *Id.* at ¶ 7.

24 On or around October 17, 2025, Plaintiffs’ counsel sent a meet and confer email  
 25 correspondence to defense counsel regarding Defendants’ deficient responses. *Id.* at ¶ 8,  
 26 Ex. G. Defense counsel failed to respond to Plaintiffs’ correspondence. *Id.* at ¶ 9.  
 27  
 28

1 On or around November 24, 2025, the Court held a discovery status conference for  
2 the parties, where Plaintiffs outlined the same concerns regarding Defendants' Responses  
3 as in the October 17, 2025 meet and confer email and detailed further below. During the  
4 conference, defense counsel repeatedly asserted the false statement they had produced  
5 supplemental Responses for all Defendants. *Id.* at ¶ 10. Later that week, defense counsel  
6 emailed Plaintiffs concerning their so-called "supplemental" Responses and asked what  
7 "other problems" Plaintiffs had with Defendants' Responses. *Id.* at ¶ 11, Ex. H. Plaintiffs  
8 responded, explaining that Plaintiffs were only in receipt of replacement responses from  
9 Defendant Reeves and attached the October 17, 2025 meet and confer email detailing  
10 Plaintiffs' concerns with Defendants' Responses. *Id.* at ¶ 12, Ex. I.

11 Instead of acknowledging their mistake, defense counsel doubled down on the claim  
12 that their initial Responses produced on September 24, 2025 were instead supplemental  
13 responses. *Id.* at ¶ 13, Ex. J. In their reply, Plaintiffs stated their understanding as such and  
14 that Plaintiffs had not received any supplemented responses from any Defendant since the  
15 September 24, 2025 production. *Id.* at ¶ 14, Ex. K. Defense counsel then sent a  
16 supplemented version of Reeves' Responses that were post-dated to October 23, 2025, and  
17 stated that supplemented versions of Defendant Lansky and Defendant Avid Telecom's  
18 Responses would be sent "shortly." *Id.* at ¶ 15, Exs. L-M. In a separate email later that day,  
19 defense counsel also falsely claimed that the October 17, 2025 meet and confer email  
20 "advise[d] of deficiencies in the Reeves responses only", and sent another version of  
21 supplemented responses for Defendant Reeves on November 26, 2025 that contained  
22 attorney work product. *Id.* at ¶ 16, Ex. N. Plaintiffs responded and assured defense counsel  
23 that the meet and confer email highlighted deficiencies in *all* Defendants' Responses, not  
24 just Defendant Reeves. *Id.* at ¶ 17, Ex. O. Defense counsel later served deficient  
25 supplemented Responses for Defendant Reeves with no attorney work product on or  
26 around December 1, 2025. *Id.* at ¶ 18, Ex. P.  
27  
28

1 Plaintiffs have attempted multiple times to clear up this issue with Defendants both  
 2 before and after the Court's status conference to no avail. Accordingly, left with no other  
 3 alternative, Plaintiffs were forced to file and serve the instant motion.

### 4 **III. ARGUMENT**

#### 5 **A. Defendants' Responses are Untimely and are Deemed Admitted under Rule 36** 6 **of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.**

7 Rule 36 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure obligates the party to whom a  
 8 request for admission is directed to respond in writing to the requests within 30 days after  
 9 being served. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 36(a)(3). Failure to respond to Requests within the 30-  
 10 day window results in automatic admission of all material contained in the Requests. Fed.  
 11 R. Civ. P. 36(b); *see Hadley v. U.S.*, 45 F.3d 1345, 1348 (9th Cir. 1995) (“[I]f a party fails  
 12 to answer a request for admissions within 30 days, the requested items are deemed  
 13 admitted.”); *FTC v. Medicor, LLC*, 217 F. Supp.2d 1048, 1053 (C.D. Cal. 2002) (“No  
 14 motion to establish [late] admissions is needed because [Rule 36] is self executing.”);  
 15 *Wyles v. Sussman*, 445 F. Supp. 3d 751, 756 (C.D. Cal. 2020).

16 Here, Defendants were served with Plaintiffs' Requests for Admission on August  
 17 20, 2025. *See* Pelton Decl. at ¶ 3, Ex. A. The original statutory deadline for Defendants to  
 18 serve their responses was Friday, September 19, 2025. However, Defendants did not serve  
 19 any responses by that date. Instead, on the very day their responses were due, Defendants  
 20 sought an extension of time to respond. *Id.* at ¶ 5, Ex. B.

21 The parties subsequently stipulated to extend Defendants' deadline to respond to  
 22 September 23, 2025. *Id.* at ¶ 5, Ex. B. Despite this accommodation, Defendants again failed  
 23 to meet their deadline and did not serve their responses until September 24, 2025. *Id.* at ¶¶  
 24 6-7, Exs. C-F. Because Defendants failed to serve timely responses by both the statutory  
 25 and stipulated deadlines, their untimely responses must be deemed admissions pursuant to  
 26 Rule 36(a)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.  
 27  
 28

1 **B. Defendants’ Untimely Responses Are Replete With Unintelligible Errors and**  
 2 **Improper Objections Making Them Insufficient under the Federal Rules of**  
 3 **Civil Procedure.**

4 Even if the Court were to excuse Defendants’ untimeliness (*arguendo*), their  
 5 responses are nonetheless deficient and violate Rule 36 of the Federal Rules of Civil  
 6 Procedure.

7 **1. Defendant Reeves’ Responses Are Insufficient Because They Contain**  
 8 **Numerous Errors Rendering Them Unintelligible and Unusable at Trial.**

9 Defendants’ untimely responses are insufficient because they contain typographical  
 10 errors that render them unintelligible and unusable. Defendant Reeves’ initial and  
 11 supplemented responses inconsistently refer to the Defendant in both the first and third  
 12 person, further compounding the confusion and lack of clarity in Defendant Reeves’  
 13 responses.<sup>1</sup> These pervasive errors make it impractical to rely on the responses for any  
 14 evidentiary or procedural purpose.

15 The numerous typographical errors contained in Defendant Reeves’ initial untimely  
 16 Responses, and still present in her supplemented Responses, render them insufficient under  
 17 Rule 36 and require Defendant Reeves to serve corrected and supplemental responses that  
 18 clearly correspond to each Request.

19 **2. Defendants’ Responses are Insufficient Because They Rely on Meritless**  
 20 **and Boilerplate Objections.**

21 Defendants’ untimely responses are further deficient because they rely almost  
 22 entirely on meritless and boilerplate objections. Rule 36 requires any party objecting to a  
 23 request for admission to state “[t]he grounds for objecting[.]” Fed. R. Civ. P. 36(a)(5).  
 24 Boilerplate or copy-and-pasted objections to requests for admission are not sufficient. *A.*  
 25 *Farber & Partners, Inc. v. Garber*, 234 F.R.D. 186, 188 (C.D. Cal. 2006) (“[G]eneral or  
 26

---

27  
 28 <sup>1</sup> See Reeves Supplemented Response Nos. 40, 58, 85, 91, 99, 102, 113, 122, 128, 131,  
 134, 137, 140, 148, 151, 161, 181, 185, 189, 193, 197, 205, 211, 215, 219, 223, 227, 231,  
 235, 243, 255, 259.

boilerplate objections such as ‘overly burdensome and harassing’ are improper—especially when a party fails to submit any evidentiary declarations supporting such objections,” and “boilerplate relevancy objections, without setting forth any explanation or argument why the requested documents are not relevant, are improper.”); *Duran v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, 258 F.R.D. 375, 379 (C.D. Cal. 2009) (noting that “unexplained and unsupported boilerplate objections are improper”); *Pellerin v. Wagner*, No. 2:14-cv-02318-JWS, 2016 WL 950792 at \*1 (D. Ariz. Mar. 14, 2016). An objection that a request is “ambiguous” is not a sufficient ground unless the request is so ambiguous that a party cannot make good faith, intelligent reply.

Here, Plaintiffs’ Requests are simple, narrow, and seek relevant and admissible admissions related to Plaintiffs’ causes of action under the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Act, the Telemarketing Sales Rule, the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, the Truth in Caller ID Act, and other state and federal laws protecting consumers against deceptive and illegal telemarketing practices and Defendants’ claimed defenses thereto. Specifically, these Requests seek relevant admissions relating to:

1. Defendants’ direct/indirect knowledge of and involvement in assisting, facilitating, servicing, managing, permitting and compensating telemarketers, customers and/or sellers in transmitting and delivering millions of prerecorded telephone and robocalls<sup>2</sup>;

---

<sup>2</sup> Request to Reeves Nos. 9, 14-158, 161-63, 165-67, 169-71, 173-75, 177-79, 181-83, 185-87, 189-91, 193-95, 197-99, 201-03, 205-09, 211-13, 2115-17, 219-21, 223-25, 227-29, 231-33, 235-37, 239-41, 243-45, 247-62, 264-75, 280-82, 284-89, 291-93, 295-97, 299, 308-310; Request to Avid Telecom Nos. 1-156, 159-61, 163-65, 167-69, 171-73, 175-77, 179-81, 183-85, 187-89, 191-93, 195-97, 199-201, 203-07, 209-11, 213-15, 217-19, 221-23, 225-27, 229-31, 233-35, 237-39, 241-43, 245-60, 262-68, 274-76, 278-80, 282-83, 285-87, 297-99; Request to Lansky Nos. 1-156, 159-61, 163-65, 167-69, 171-73, 175-77, 179-81, 183-85, 187-89, 191-93, 195-97, 199-201, 203-07, 209-11, 213-15, 217-19, 221-23, 225-27, 229-31, 233-35, 237-39, 241-43, 245-60, 262-74, 279-85, 287-97, 299-300, 302-04, 314-16.

1           2. Defendants’ knowledge of and compliance with applicable Federal  
2           and State laws and regulations regarding corporate record retention,  
3           telemarketing and robocall schemes<sup>3</sup>;

4           3. The procedures and methods to prevent—or even significantly  
5           mitigate—the perpetration of illegal call traffic onto and across Defendants’  
6           Avid Telecom’s network<sup>4</sup>;

7           4. Defendants’ prior statements regarding knowledge of and compliance  
8           with applicable Federal and State laws, regulations, and previous litigation  
9           regarding corporate record retention, telemarketing and robocall schemes<sup>5</sup>;

10          5. The veracity of Defendant Reeves’s claims that she is/was “limited in  
11          her role as an independent contractor”<sup>6</sup>;

12          6. Evidentiary admissions regarding Defendants’ existing document  
13          production<sup>7</sup>.

14  
15          In response to these Requests, Defendants assert the same tired objections, over and  
16          over, without explaining how the objections actually apply to each individual Request.  
17          Defendants repeat that the Requests are irrelevant, vague and ambiguous and call for legal

18  
19  
20          <sup>3</sup> Request to Reeves Nos. 1-8, 12, 13; Request to Avid Telecom Nos. 269-71; Request to  
21          Lansky Nos. 275-76.

22          <sup>4</sup> Request to Reeves Nos. 10-11, 276-79; Request to Avid Telecom Nos. 157-58, 272-73;  
23          Request to Lansky Nos. 277-78.

24          <sup>5</sup> Request to Reeves Nos. 159-60, 164, 168, 172, 176, 180, 184, 188, 192, 196, 200, 204,  
25          210, 214, 218, 222, 226, 230, 234, 238, 242, 246, 263; Request to Avid Telecom Nos. 157-  
26          58, 162, 166, 170, 174, 178, 182, 186, 190, 194, 198, 202, 208, 212, 216, 220, 224, 228,  
27          232, 236, 240, 244, 261; Request to Lansky Nos. 157-158, 162, 166, 170, 174, 178, 182,  
28          186, 190, 194, 198, 202, 208, 212, 216, 220, 224, 228, 232, 236, 240, 244, 261.

<sup>6</sup> Request to Reeves Nos. 300-07; Request to Avid Telecom Nos. 289-96; Request to  
        Lansky Nos. 306-313.

<sup>7</sup> Request to Reeves Nos. 283, 290, 294, 298; Request to Avid Telecom Nos. 277, 281,  
        284, 288; Request to Lansky Nos. 286, 298, 301, 305.

conclusions based on “specialized definitions” to which Defendants do not agree.<sup>8</sup> But Defendants’ boilerplate and generalized objections are inadequate under the Rules and are tantamount to no objection at all. *See Walker v. Lakewood Condo. Owners Ass’n*, 186 F.R.D. 584, 587 (C.D. Cal. 1999) (“Boilerplate, generalized objections are inadequate and tantamount to not making any objection at all.”). For example, Defendants frequently object to the terms like “Business Relationship” as vague and ambiguous, although Plaintiffs defined this and other terms with ample specificity in their instructions. Defendants provide no substantiation to their frequent assertions that a Request is irrelevant. Additionally, in response to certain Requests<sup>9</sup>, Defendant Reeves’s Responses begin with “Response: Response:”. The fact that this error and others similar were repeated multiple times further highlights the boilerplate or cut-and-paste nature of Defendants’ responses and objections.<sup>10</sup>

**3. Defendants’ Untimely and Supplemented Responses Are Insufficient Because They are Evasive, Qualified, and Based on an Unreasonable Reading of Plaintiffs’ Actual Requests.**

Defendants’ untimely and supplemented responses are also insufficient because they are evasive and based on Defendants’ unilateral qualifications and unreasonable interpretations of Plaintiffs’ actual Requests. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 36 requires the answering party to respond in one of three ways to a Request for Admission: (1) admit the Request; (2) deny the Request; or (3) explain “why the answering party is unable to admit or deny the matter.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 36(a)(4); *see also AmeriPride Servs., Inc. v. Valley Indus. Servs., Inc.*, No. CIV 2:00-cv-0113-LKK-JFM, 2011 WL 1321873, at \*2

---

<sup>8</sup> *See, e.g.* Lansky Response No. 27 (objecting to “Telephony Services” because “he does not agree” with Plaintiffs’ definition); Reeves Response No. 1 (objecting to “Interconnected VoIP services”); Avid Telecom Response No. 36 (objecting to “Non-Provider Customer”).

<sup>9</sup> *See, e.g.*, Reeves Supplemented Response Nos. 44, 63, 73, 199.

<sup>10</sup> *See, e.g.*, Reeves Supplemented Response Nos. 15, 21-22, 24, 26, 29, 31, 43, 44, 60, 63, 73, 84, 106-07, 199, 215, 279.

(E.D. Cal. Apr. 1, 2011). Rule 36 serves to expedite matters for trial by “establishing certain material facts as true and thus narrowing the range of issues[.]” *Asea, Inc. v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co.*, 669 F.2d 1242, 1245 (9th Cir. 1981). “A denial must fairly respond to the substance of the matter; and when good faith requires that a party qualify an answer or deny only a part of a matter, the answer must specify the part admitted and qualify or deny the rest.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 36(a)(4).

Requests for admission should not focus on evasion and word play. *Marchand v. Mercy Med. Ctr.*, 22 F.3d 933, 936 (9th Cir. 1994) (“Parties may not view requests for admission as a mere procedural exercise requiring minimally acceptable conduct.”). When the purpose and significance of a request are reasonably clear, courts do not permit denials based on an overly technical reading of the request. *Holmgren v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 976 F.2d 573, 580 (9th Cir. 1992) (“[E]pistemological doubts speak highly of [a party's] philosophical sophistication, but poorly of its respect for Rule 36(a).”); *see also U.S. ex rel. Englund v. Los Angeles Cty.*, 235 F.R.D. 675, 684 (E.D. Cal. 2006) (“[A] party who is unable to agree with the exact wording of the request for admission should agree to an alternate wording or stipulation.”). Further, evasive denials, or responses that do “not set forth in detail the reasons why the answering party cannot truthfully admit or deny the matter, may be deemed an admission.” *Asea, Inc.*, 669 F.2d at 1245.

Here, a majority, if not the entirety, of each Defendant’s responses are deficient under Rule 36 because they (1) explicitly premise each response on stated objections, (2) improperly introduce unsupported opinions about observance of industry standards of care, and (3) claim they are unable to understand common terms.

Specifically, many responses include an unnecessary, self-serving qualification that Avid Telecom complied with all applicable state and federal regulations, which few, if any, of the Requests actually sought.<sup>11</sup> Rule 36 does not permit Defendants to rewrite Plaintiffs’

---

<sup>11</sup> *See, e.g.*, Reeves Supplemented Response No. 55 (**Request:** “Admit that Defendant Avid Telecom had a Business Relationship with Airespring.” **Response:** “Subject to and without

specifically defined terms and fundamentally alter the terms of the request to avoid responding to the question Plaintiffs asked. Further, responses to nearly identical Requests are inconsistent from defendant to defendant. In response to Request 8, Defendant Reeves states she does not understand easily recognizable terms that do not require a separate definition, such as “Universal Service Fund filing”, but Defendants Lansky and Avid Telecom do understand the term in their responses to Request 8. Additionally, in many instances where Defendants have issues on definitions, they do not provide a response at all, such as Defendant Reeves’s response to Request No. 291, where she objected that the word “exclusive” was too vague. Finally, many of Defendants’ responses are unintelligible and lack a clear indication of admission or denial.<sup>12</sup>

Defendants’ deliberate efforts to evade and alter the substance of the Requests propounded upon them are improper and in direct violation of Rule 36 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Rule 36(a)(4) requires Defendants to admit or specifically deny each Request or state in detail why they cannot, which Defendants failed to do, instead relying on improper boilerplate objections and qualifications. Consequently, Plaintiffs request the Court order Defendants to strike the responses to the certain aforementioned Requests and order Defendants to serve new responses.

---

waiving the General Objections and the Specific Objections stated above, Reeves admits that to the best of her current recollection, knowledge and belief, and on the understanding that Reeves had no authority to agree to establish a Business Relationship, it is her understanding that Avid Telecom had a Business Relationship with Airespring. It is my recollection that, among other things, the agreement governing that ‘Business Relationship’ required Airespring to represent and warrant to Avid Telecom that all of the traffic that they sent to Avid Telecom complied with all applicable state and federal regulations, specifically including without limitation, all state and federal regulations governing robocalls”); Lansky Response No. 33, Avid Telecom Response No. 68.

<sup>12</sup> *E.g.* Lansky Response to Request No. 10 (“Lansky denies that, to the best of his current recollection, knowledge and belief, it is his understanding that Lansky has never, either directly or through a third party (e.g., a third-party switch provider), have ever instituted or implemented any policies or processes. . .”); Reeves’s Supplemented Responses to Request Nos. 58, 85, 91, 99, 102, 113, 122, 128, 131, 134, 137, 140, 148, 151, 161, 181, 185, 189, 193, 197, 205, 211, 215, 219, 223, 227, 231, 235, 243, 255, 259.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**IV. CONCLUSION**

For the reasons set forth above, Plaintiffs respectfully request the Court to order Defendants to provide responses without objection to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Admission.

1 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 5th day of December 2025.

2  
3 **FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA:**

4 KRISTIN K. MAYES  
5 Attorney General for the State of  
6 Arizona

7 /s/ John Raymond Dillon IV  
8 JOHN RAYMOND DILLON IV  
9 SARAH PELTON  
10 Assistant Attorneys General  
11 *Attorneys for the State of Arizona*

**FOR THE STATE OF NORTH  
CAROLINA:**

JEFF JACKSON  
Attorney General for the State of North  
Carolina

/s/ Tracy Nayer  
TRACY NAYER  
ROCHELLE SPARKO  
Special Deputy Attorneys General  
*Attorneys for the State of North Carolina*

12 **FOR THE STATE OF INDIANA:**

13 TODD ROKITA  
14 Attorney General for the State of Indiana

15 /s/ Douglas S. Swetnam  
16 DOUGLAS S. SWETNAM  
17 THOMAS L. MARTINDALE  
18 Deputy Attorneys General  
*Attorneys for the State of Indiana*

**FOR THE STATE OF OHIO:**

DAVE YOST  
Attorney General for the State of Ohio

/s/ Erin B. Leahy  
ERIN B. LEAHY  
EMILY G. DIETZ  
Assistant Attorneys General  
*Attorneys for the State of Ohio*

19  
20 *Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs*  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on December 5, 2025, I caused the foregoing  
**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO DETERMINE THE SUFFICIENCY OF**  
**DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST**  
**REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION** to be filed and served electronically via the Court's  
CM/ECF system upon counsel of record.

/s/ Sarah Pelton

Assistant Attorney General

Counsel for the Plaintiff State of Arizona

**LIST OF PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL**

John Raymond Dillon IV (AZ Bar No. 036796)  
 Sarah Pelton (AZ Bar No. 039633)  
 Assistant Attorneys General  
 Arizona Attorney General's Office  
 2005 North Central Avenue  
 Phoenix, AZ 85004  
 Phone: (602) 542-8018  
 Fax: (602) 542-4377  
[john.dillonIV@azag.gov](mailto:john.dillonIV@azag.gov)  
[sarah.pelton@azag.gov](mailto:sarah.pelton@azag.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Arizona*

Douglas S. Swetnam (IN Bar No. 15860-49)  
 Thomas L. Martindale (IN Bar No. 29706-64)  
 Deputy Attorneys General  
 Office of the Indiana Attorney General  
 Todd Rokita  
 Indiana Govt. Center South, 5th Fl.  
 302 W. Washington St.  
 Indianapolis, IN 46204-2770  
 Phone: (317) 232-6294 (Swetnam)  
 (317) 232-7751 (Martindale)  
 Fax: (317) 232-7979  
[douglas.swetnam@atg.in.gov](mailto:douglas.swetnam@atg.in.gov)  
[thomas.martindale@atg.in.gov](mailto:thomas.martindale@atg.in.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Indiana*

Tracy Nayer (NC Bar No. 36964)  
 Rochelle Sparko (NC Bar No. 38528)  
 Special Deputy Attorneys General  
 North Carolina Department of Justice  
 Consumer Protection Division  
 P.O. Box 629  
 Raleigh, North Carolina 27602  
 Phone: (919) 716-6000  
 Fax: (919) 716-6050  
[tnayer@ncdoj.gov](mailto:tnayer@ncdoj.gov)  
[rsparko@ncdoj.gov](mailto:rsparko@ncdoj.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of North Carolina*

Erin B. Leahy (OH Bar No. 0069509)  
 Emily G. Dietz (OH Bar No. 0104729)  
 Assistant Attorneys General  
 Office of Attorney General Dave Yost  
 30 East Broad Street, 14th Fl.  
 Columbus, OH 43215  
 Phone: (614) 752-4730 (Leahy)  
 (614) 466-3493 (Dietz)  
[Erin.Leahy@OhioAGO.gov](mailto:Erin.Leahy@OhioAGO.gov)  
[Emily.Dietz@OhioAGO.gov](mailto:Emily.Dietz@OhioAGO.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Ohio*

***Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs***

Lindsay D. Barton (AL Bar No. 1165-G00N)  
 Robert D. Tambling (AL Bar No. 6026-N67R)  
 Assistant Attorneys General  
 Office of the Alabama Attorney General  
 501 Washington Avenue  
 Montgomery, Alabama 36130  
 Phone: (334) 353-2609 (Barton)  
           (334) 242-7445 (Tambling)  
 Fax: (334) 353-8400  
[Lindsay.Barton@AlabamaAG.gov](mailto:Lindsay.Barton@AlabamaAG.gov)  
[Robert.Tambling@AlabamaAG.gov](mailto:Robert.Tambling@AlabamaAG.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Alabama*

Amanda Wentz (AR Bar No. 2021066)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Office of Attorney General Tim Griffin  
 101 West Capitol Avenue  
 Little Rock, AR 72201  
 Phone: (501) 682-1178  
 Fax: (501) 682-8118  
[amanda.wentz@arkansasag.gov](mailto:amanda.wentz@arkansasag.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Arkansas*

Nicklas A. Akers (CA Bar No. 211222)  
 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
 Bernard A. Eskandari (CA Bar No. 244395)  
 Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
 Timothy D. Lundgren (CA Bar No. 254596)  
 Rosailda Perez (CA Bar No. 284646)  
 Deputy Attorneys General  
 Office of the California Attorney General  
 300 S. Spring St., Suite 1702  
 Los Angeles, CA 90013  
 Phone: (415) 510-3364 (Akers)  
           (213) 269-6348 (Eskandari)  
           (213) 269-6355 (Lundgren)  
           (213) 269-6612 (Perez)  
 Fax: (916) 731-2146  
[nicklas.akers@doj.ca.gov](mailto:nicklas.akers@doj.ca.gov)  
[bernard.eskandari@doj.ca.gov](mailto:bernard.eskandari@doj.ca.gov)  
[timothy.lundgren@doj.ca.gov](mailto:timothy.lundgren@doj.ca.gov)  
[rosailda.perez@doj.ca.gov](mailto:rosailda.perez@doj.ca.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff People of the State of California*

Michel Singer Nelson (CO Bar No. 19779)  
 Assistant Attorney General II  
 Colorado Office of the Attorney General  
 Ralph L. Carr Judicial Building  
 1300 Broadway, 10th Floor  
 Denver, CO 80203  
 Phone: (720) 508-6220  
[michel.singernelson@coag.gov](mailto:michel.singernelson@coag.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Colorado, ex rel. Philip J. Weiser, Attorney General*

1 Brendan T. Flynn (Fed. Bar No. ct04545,  
 2 CT Bar No. 419935)  
 3 Assistant Attorney General  
 4 Office of the Connecticut Attorney  
 5 General William Tong  
 6 165 Capitol Avenue, Suite 4000  
 7 Hartford, CT 06106  
 8 Phone: (860) 808-5400  
 9 Fax: (860) 808-5593  
 10 brendan.flynn@ct.gov  
 11 *Attorney for Plaintiff State of*  
 12 *Connecticut*

13 Ryan Costa (DE Bar No. 5325)  
 14 Deputy Attorney General  
 15 Delaware Department of Justice  
 16 820 N. French Street, 5th Floor  
 17 Wilmington, DE 19801  
 18 Phone: (302) 683-8811  
 19 Fax: (302) 577-6499  
 20 [Ryan.costa@delaware.gov](mailto:Ryan.costa@delaware.gov)  
 21 *Attorney for Plaintiff State of Delaware*

22 Laura C. Beckerman (DC Bar No.  
 23 1008120)  
 24 Senior Trial Counsel  
 25 Public Advocacy Division  
 26 D.C. Office of the Attorney General  
 27 400 6th Street NW, 10th Floor  
 28 Washington, DC 20001  
 Phone: (202) 655-7906  
[Laura.Beckerman@dc.gov](mailto:Laura.Beckerman@dc.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff District of*  
*Columbia*

Sean P. Saval (FL Bar No. 96500)  
 Sr. Assistant Attorney General  
 Michael P. Roland (FL Bar No. 44856)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Office of the Florida Attorney General  
 Department of Legal Affairs  
 Consumer Protection Division  
 3507 E. Frontage Rd, Suite 325  
 Tampa, FL 33607  
 Phone: (813) 287-7950  
 Fax: (813) 281-5515  
[Sean.Saval@myfloridalegal.com](mailto:Sean.Saval@myfloridalegal.com)  
[michael.roland@myfloridalegal.com](mailto:michael.roland@myfloridalegal.com)  
[Zivile.Rimkevicius@myfloridalegal.com](mailto:Zivile.Rimkevicius@myfloridalegal.com)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff James Uthmeier,*  
*Attorney General of the State of Florida*

David A. Zisook (GA Bar No. 310104)  
 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
 Office of the Georgia Attorney General  
 40 Capitol Square SW  
 Atlanta, GA 30334  
 Phone: (404) 458-4294  
 Fax: (404) 464-8212  
[dzisook@law.ga.gov](mailto:dzisook@law.ga.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Georgia*

Christopher J.I. Leong (HI Bar No.  
 9662)  
 Deputy Attorney General  
 Hawaii Department of the Attorney  
 General  
 425 Queen Street  
 Honolulu, HI 96813  
 Phone: (808) 586-1180  
 Fax: (808) 586-1205  
[christopher.ji.leong@hawaii.gov](mailto:christopher.ji.leong@hawaii.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Hawaii*

James J. Simeri (ID Bar No. 12332)  
 Consumer Protection Division Chief  
 Idaho Attorney General's Office  
 P.O. Box 83720  
 Boise, ID 83720-0010  
 Phone: (208) 334-4114  
[james.simeri@ag.idaho.gov](mailto:james.simeri@ag.idaho.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Idaho*

Philip Heimlich (IL Bar No. 6286375)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Elizabeth Blackston (IL Bar No.  
 6228859)

Consumer Fraud Bureau Chief  
 Office of the Illinois Attorney General  
 500 S. Second Street  
 Springfield, IL 62791  
 Phone: (217) 782-4436  
[philip.heimlich@ilag.gov](mailto:philip.heimlich@ilag.gov)  
[elizabeth.blackston@ilag.gov](mailto:elizabeth.blackston@ilag.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff People of the State  
 of Illinois*

Benjamin Bellus (IA Bar No.  
 AT0000688)

William Pearson (IA Bar No.  
 AT0012070)  
 Assistant Attorneys General  
 Office of the Iowa Attorney General  
 1305 E. Walnut St.  
 Des Moines, IA 50319  
 Phone: (515) 242-6536 (Bellus)  
 (515) 242-6773 (Pearson)  
 Fax: (515) 281-6771

[Benjamin.Bellus@ag.iowa.gov](mailto:Benjamin.Bellus@ag.iowa.gov)  
[William.Pearson@ag.iowa.gov](mailto:William.Pearson@ag.iowa.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Iowa*

Nicholas C. Smith (KS Bar No. 29742)  
 Sarah M. Dietz (KS Bar No. 27457)  
 Assistant Attorneys General  
 Consumer Protection Section  
 Office of the Kansas Attorney General  
 120 SW 10th Avenue, 2nd Floor  
 Topeka, KS 66612  
 Phone: (785) 296-3751  
 Fax: (785) 291-3699

[Nicholas.Smith@ag.ks.gov](mailto:Nicholas.Smith@ag.ks.gov)  
[sarah.dietz@ag.ks.gov](mailto:sarah.dietz@ag.ks.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Kansas*

Jonathan E. Farmer (KY Bar No. 91999)  
 Deputy Executive Director of Consumer  
 Protection  
 Office of the Attorney General of  
 Kentucky  
 1024 Capital Center Drive, Ste. 200  
 Frankfort, KY 40601  
 Phone: (502) 696-5448  
 Fax: (502) 573-8317  
[Jonathan.Farmer@ky.gov](mailto:Jonathan.Farmer@ky.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff Commonwealth of  
 Kentucky*

ZaTabia N. Williams (LA Bar No.  
 36933)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Office of the Attorney General Liz  
 Murrill

1885 North Third St.  
 Baton Rouge, LA 70802  
 Phone: (225) 326-6164  
 Fax: (225) 326-6499  
[WilliamsZ@ag.louisiana.gov](mailto:WilliamsZ@ag.louisiana.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Louisiana*

1 Brendan O'Neil (ME Bar No. 009900)  
 2 Michael Devine (ME Bar No. 005048)  
 3 Assistant Attorneys General  
 4 Office of the Maine Attorney General  
 5 6 State House Station  
 6 Augusta, ME 04333  
 7 Phone: (207) 626-8800  
 8 Fax: (207) 624-7730  
 9 [brendan.oneil@maine.gov](mailto:brendan.oneil@maine.gov)  
 10 [michael.devine@maine.gov](mailto:michael.devine@maine.gov)  
 11 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Maine*

12 Philip Ziperman (Fed. Bar No. 12430)  
 13 Deputy Counsel  
 14 Office of the Attorney General  
 15 200 St. Paul Place  
 16 Baltimore, MD 21202  
 17 Phone: (410) 576-6417  
 18 Fax: (410) 576-6566  
 19 [pziperman@oag.state.md.us](mailto:pziperman@oag.state.md.us)  
 20 *Attorney for Plaintiff Maryland Office of*  
 21 *the Attorney General*

22 Carol Guerrero (MA Bar No. 705419)  
 23 Assistant Attorney General  
 24 Michael N. Turi (MA Bar No. 706205)  
 25 Deputy Chief, Consumer Protection  
 26 Division  
 27 Massachusetts Office of the Attorney  
 28 General  
 One Ashburton Place, 18th Floor  
 Boston, MA 02108  
 Phone: (617) 963-2783  
 Fax: (617) 727-5765  
<mailto:Carol.Guerrero@mass.gov>  
[Michael.Turi@mass.gov](mailto:Michael.Turi@mass.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff Commonwealth of*  
*Massachusetts*

Kathy P. Fitzgerald (MI Bar No.  
 P31454)  
 Michael S. Hill (MI Bar No. P73084)  
 Assistant Attorneys General  
 Michigan Department of Attorney  
 General  
 Corporate Oversight Division  
 P.O. Box 30736  
 Lansing, MI 48909  
 Phone: (517) 335-7632  
 Fax: (517) 335-6755  
[fitzgeraldk@michigan.gov](mailto:fitzgeraldk@michigan.gov)  
[Hillm19@michigan.gov](mailto:Hillm19@michigan.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff People of the*  
*State of Michigan*

Bennett Hartz (MN Bar No. 0393136)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Office of the Minnesota Attorney  
 General  
 445 Minnesota Street, Suite 1200  
 Saint Paul, MN 55404  
 Phone: (651) 757-1235  
[bennett.hartz@ag.state.mn.us](mailto:bennett.hartz@ag.state.mn.us)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Minnesota,*  
*by its Attorney General, Keith Ellison*

James M. Rankin (MS Bar No. 102332)  
 Special Assistant Attorney General  
 Mississippi Attorney General's Office  
 P.O. Box 220  
 Jackson, MS 39205  
 Phone: (601) 359-4258  
[james.rankin@ago.ms.gov](mailto:james.rankin@ago.ms.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff Lynn Fitch,*  
*Attorney General State of Mississippi*

1 Eliot Gusdorf (MO Bar No. 73225)  
 2 Assistant Attorney General  
 3 Office of the Missouri Attorney General  
 4 815 Olive Street, Suite 200  
 5 St. Louis, MO 63101  
 6 Phone: (314) 340-6816  
 7 Fax: (314) 340-7891  
 8 [eliot.gusdorf@ago.mo.gov](mailto:eliot.gusdorf@ago.mo.gov)  
 9 *Attorney for Plaintiff State of Missouri,*  
 10 *ex. rel. Catherine L. Hanaway, Attorney*  
 11 *General*

12 Brent Mead (MT Bar No. 68035000)  
 13 Deputy Solicitor General  
 14 Anna Schneider (MT Bar No. 13963)  
 15 Special Assistant Attorney General,  
 16 Senior Counsel  
 17 Montana Attorney General's Office  
 18 Office of Consumer Protection  
 19 215 North Sanders Street  
 20 P.O. Box 200151  
 21 Helena, MT 59620-0151  
 22 Phone: (406) 444-4500  
 23 [Brent.mead2@mt.gov](mailto:Brent.mead2@mt.gov)  
 24 [Anna.schneider@mt.gov](mailto:Anna.schneider@mt.gov)  
 25 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Montana*

26 Gary E. Brollier (NE Bar No. 19785)  
 27 Assistant Attorney General  
 28 Office of the Attorney General Michael  
 T. Hilgers  
 2115 State Capitol Building  
 Consumer Protection Division  
 Lincoln, NE 68509  
 Phone: (402) 471-1279  
 Fax: (402) 471-4725  
[gary.brollier@nebraska.gov](mailto:gary.brollier@nebraska.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Nebraska*

Michelle C. Badorine (NV Bar No.  
 13206)  
 Senior Deputy Attorney General  
 Office of the Nevada Attorney General  
 Bureau of Consumer Protection  
 100 North Carson Street  
 Carson City, NV 89701-4717  
 Phone: (775) 684-1164  
 Fax: (775) 684-1299  
[MBadorine@ag.nv.gov](mailto:MBadorine@ag.nv.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Nevada*

Mary F. Stewart (NH Bar No. 10067)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 New Hampshire Department of Justice  
 Office of the Attorney General  
 Consumer Protection and Antitrust  
 Bureau  
 1 Granite Place South  
 Concord, NH 03301  
 Phone: (603) 271-1139  
[Mary.F.Stewart@doj.nh.gov](mailto:Mary.F.Stewart@doj.nh.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of New  
 Hampshire*

Blair Gerold (NJ Bar No. 294602019)  
 Jeffrey Koziar (NJ Bar No. 015131999)  
 Deputy Attorneys General  
 New Jersey Office of the Attorney  
 General  
 Division of Law  
 124 Halsey Street  
 Newark, NJ 07101  
 Phone: (609) 696-5363  
 Fax: (973) 648-3879  
[Blair.Gerold@law.njoag.gov](mailto:Blair.Gerold@law.njoag.gov)  
[Jeff.koziar@law.njoag.gov](mailto:Jeff.koziar@law.njoag.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of New  
 Jersey*

1 Anthony Juzaitis (NM Bar No. 164428)  
 2 Assistant Attorney General  
 3 New Mexico Department of Justice  
 408 Galisteo St.  
 5 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501  
 6 Phone: (505) 651-7565  
 7 Fax: (505) 490-4883  
 8 [Ajuzaitis@nmdoj.gov](mailto:Ajuzaitis@nmdoj.gov)  
 9 *Attorney for Plaintiff Raúl Torrez, New*  
 10 *Mexico Attorney General*

11 Glenna Goldis (NY Bar No. 4868600)  
 12 Assistant Attorney General  
 13 Office of the New York State Attorney  
 14 General  
 15 28 Liberty Street  
 16 New York, NY 10005  
 17 Phone: (646) 856-3697  
 18 [Glenna.goldis@ag.ny.gov](mailto:Glenna.goldis@ag.ny.gov)  
 19 *Attorney for Plaintiff Office of the*  
 20 *Attorney General of the State of New*  
 21 *York*

22 Elin S. Alm (ND Bar No. 05924)  
 23 Christopher Glenn Lindblad (ND Bar  
 24 No. 06480)  
 25 Assistant Attorneys General  
 26 Office of North Dakota Attorney General  
 27 Consumer Protection & Antitrust  
 28 Division  
 1720 Burlington Drive, Suite C  
 Bismarck, ND 58504-7736  
 Phone: (701) 328-5570  
 Fax: (701) 328-5568  
[mailto:ealm@nd.gov](mailto:mailto:ealm@nd.gov)  
[clindblad@nd.gov](mailto:clindblad@nd.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of North*  
*Dakota*

Sylvia Lanfair (OK Bar No. 30144)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Office of the Oklahoma Attorney  
 General  
 313 N.E. 21st St.  
 Oklahoma City, OK 73105  
 Phone: (405) 522- 8129  
 Fax: (405) 522-0085  
[mailto:sylvia.lanfair@oag.ok.gov](mailto:mailto:sylvia.lanfair@oag.ok.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Oklahoma*  
*ex rel. Attorney General Gentner*  
*Drummond*

Jordan M. Roberts (OR Bar No. 115010)  
 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
 Oregon Department of Justice  
 Economic Justice Section  
 100 SW Market St.  
 Portland, OR 97201  
 Phone: (971) 673-1880  
 Fax: (971) 673-1884  
[jordan.m.roberts@doj.oregon.gov](mailto:jordan.m.roberts@doj.oregon.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Oregon*

Mark W Wolfe (PA Bar No. 327807)  
 Deputy Attorney General  
 Pennsylvania Office of Attorney General  
 Strawberry Square, 15th Floor  
 Harrisburg, PA 17120-0001  
 Phone: (717) 772-3558  
 Fax: (717) 705-3795  
[mwolfe@attorneygeneral.gov](mailto:mwolfe@attorneygeneral.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff Commonwealth of*  
*Pennsylvania by Attorney General David*  
*W. Sunday, Jr.*

Stephen N. Provazza (RI Bar No. 10435)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Rhode Island Office of the Attorney  
 General  
 150 S. Main Street  
 Providence, RI 02903  
 Phone: (401) 274-4400, ext. 2476  
 Fax: (401) 222-1766  
[sprovazza@riag.ri.gov](mailto:sprovazza@riag.ri.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Rhode  
 Island*

Kristin Simons (SC Bar No. 74004)  
 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
 South Carolina Attorney General's  
 Office  
 P.O. Box 11549  
 Columbia, SC 29211-1549  
 Phone: (803) 734-6134  
<mailto:ksimons@scag.gov>  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of South  
 Carolina*

Austin C. Ostiguy (TN Bar No. 040301)  
 Tyler T. Corcoran (TN Bar No. 038887)  
 Assistant Attorneys General  
 Office of the Tennessee Attorney  
 General  
 P.O. Box 20207  
 Nashville, TN 37202  
 Phone: (615) 532-7271 (Ostiguy)  
 (615) 770-1714 (Corcoran)  
 Fax: (615) 532-2910  
[austin.ostiguy@ag.tn.gov](mailto:austin.ostiguy@ag.tn.gov)  
[tyler.corcoran@ag.tn.gov](mailto:tyler.corcoran@ag.tn.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Tennessee*

David Shatto (Fed. Bar No. 3725697; TX  
 Bar No. 24104114)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Attorney General for the State of Texas  
 Office of the Attorney General  
 P.O. Box 12548 (MC-010)  
 Austin, TX 78711  
 Phone: (512) 463-2185  
 Fax: (512) 473-9125  
[David.Shatto@oag.texas.gov](mailto:David.Shatto@oag.texas.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Texas*

Alexandra Butler (UT Bar No. 19238)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Utah Attorney General's Office  
 160 East 300 South, 5th Floor  
 P.O. Box 140872  
 Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0872  
 Phone: (385) 910-5533  
 Fax: (801) 366-0315  
[alexandrabutler@agutah.gov](mailto:alexandrabutler@agutah.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff Utah Division of  
 Consumer Protection*

James Layman (VT Bar No. 5236)  
 Office of the Vermont Attorney General  
 109 State Street  
 Montpelier, VT 05609-1001  
 Phone: (802) 828-2315  
 Fax: (802) 304-1014  
[James.Layman@vermont.gov](mailto:James.Layman@vermont.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Vermont*

Geoffrey L. Ward (VA Bar No. 89818)  
 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
 Office of the Attorney General of  
 Virginia  
 202 N. Ninth St.  
 Richmond, VA 23219  
 Phone: (804) 371-0871  
 Fax: (804) 786-0122  
[gward@oag.state.va.us](mailto:gward@oag.state.va.us)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff Commonwealth of  
 Virginia, ex rel. Jason S. Miyares,  
 Attorney General*

Zorba Leslie (WA Bar No. 58523)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Washington State Attorney General's  
 Office  
 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000  
 Seattle, WA 98104  
 Phone: (206) 340-6787  
 Fax: (206) 464-6451  
[zorba.leslie@atg.wa.gov](mailto:zorba.leslie@atg.wa.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of  
 Washington*

Ashley T. Wentz (WV Bar No. 13486)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 West Virginia Attorney General's Office  
 Consumer Protection/Antitrust Division  
 P.O. Box 1789  
 Charleston, WV 25326  
 Phone: (304) 558-8986  
 Fax: (304) 558-0184  
[Ashley.T.Wentz@wvago.gov](mailto:Ashley.T.Wentz@wvago.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of West  
 Virginia ex rel. John B. McCuskey,  
 Attorney General*

Gregory A. Myszkowski (WI Bar No.  
 1050022)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Wisconsin Department of Justice  
 P.O. Box 7857  
 Madison, WI 53707-7857  
 Phone: (608) 266-7656  
 Fax: (608) 294-2907  
[gregory.myszkowski@wisdoj.gov](mailto:gregory.myszkowski@wisdoj.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Wisconsin*

Cameron W. Geeting (WY Bar No.  
 7--5338)  
 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
 Consumer Protection and Antitrust Unit  
 Wyoming Attorney General's Office  
 2320 Capitol Avenue  
 Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002  
 Phone: (307) 777-3795  
[cameron.geeting1@wyo.gov](mailto:cameron.geeting1@wyo.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Wyoming*